

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated October 31, 2007. A one-month extension of time accompanies this Amendment. Claims 38-54 are all the claims pending in the application. With this Amendment, claims 38-40, 42, 48-50 and 53 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner made the following prior art rejections to the claims: claims 38, 39, 42-44, 47-49, and 52-54 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by the Applicants' admitted prior art (hereafter "the AAPA"); and claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 50 and 51 have been under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Schell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,735, hereafter "Schell").

The Applicants have amended independent claims 38, 43 and 48 to further distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art.

For example, as amended claim 38 recites the following relevant features:

"A storage-based broadcasting system which stores a plurality of contents to provide a service and an executable browser used for browsing the service, the storage-based broadcasting system comprising:...

said transmitting means comprises...

a content body pitcher for outputting the service content body and the browser content body stored in said first storage means,

content assembler means for assembling contents in the same format by adding a content header for defining each of the contents to the service content body and the browser content body outputted from said content body pitcher,

multiplexer means for multiplexing the contents assembled by said content assembler means, and

transmitter means for modulating the contents multiplexed by said multiplexer means and outputting the modulated contents, which contain the service content body and the

browser content body, to said receiving means...

wherein said receiving unit comprises ...

a second storage unit operable to store the contents,

a controller ...

control means for updating the contents having been stored in said second storage means with the contents held in said de-multiplexing means when it is determined, based on the information extracted from the content header, that a content of the same kind and version as the contents held in said de-multiplexing means is not stored in said second storage means....”

(Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 38 are similarly recited in independent claims 43 and 48. Additionally, the features emphasized above are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see e.g., page 9, line 24-page 10, line 4; page 10, lines 19-23; page 22, lines 1-7; page 28, line 19-page 29, line 1; page 22, lines 8-12; page 29, lines 5-7; page 23, lines 6-9; and Figs. 1 and 10 as described on page 31, line 11-page 32, line 15).

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 38, 43 and 48, is directed to solving the problems associated with conventional content broadcasting systems. That is, in conventional broadcasting systems, when a user wishes to view content, it is necessary for the user to first install and execute (on the user's terminal) browser programs prepared for the respective services associated with the content received. Additionally, the respective browsers are delivered in different ways because a browser may be unique to the service and programmed in the browser itself. Also, in conventional broadcasting systems, updating of respective browsers requires manual operation and use of the transmission methods provided for the respective browsers.

On the other hand, the storage-based content broadcasting system of the present invention (as recited in claims 38, 43 and 48) overcomes the above drawbacks of conventional broadcasting systems by not only transmitting content for various services to a receiving side, but also transmitting (at the same time) the browsers prepared for the respective services. Additionally, because the browsers are transmitted with the content using a common mechanism,

the browsers can be updated in the same manner as the content.

In summary, the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the following features of the transmitting side of the storage-based content broadcasting system of the present invention (in independent claims 38, 43 and 48):

- 1) outputting the service content body and the browser content body;
- 2) assembling contents in the same format by adding a content header for defining each of the contents to the service content body and the browser content body outputted;
- 3) multiplexing the contents assembled, which includes the service content body and the browser content body; and
- 4) modulating the contents multiplexed and outputting the modulated contents, which contain the service content body and the browser content body.

Additionally, the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the following features of the receiving side of the storage-based content broadcasting system of the present invention (in independent claims 38, 43 and 48):

- 1) updating the content having been stored with the content temporarily held when it is determined, based on the information extracted from the content header, that a content of the same kind and version as the content held is not stored.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies primarily on FIG. 24 of the AAPA for disclosing or suggesting all the features of independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

However, Fig. 24 of the AAPA discloses a transmitting apparatus 2510 that include various combinations of browser storage and a browser pitcher, and content storage and a content pitcher. As clearly illustrated in Fig. 24, each combination (i.e., browser storage and a browser pitcher, and content storage and a content pitcher) is provided for processing and outputting either a service content or a browser content. In other words, the transmitting apparatus 2150 of the AAPA is not capable of processing and outputting the service content and the browser content together.

Therefore, the AAPA fails to disclose or suggest at least the features noted above for the

transmitting side of claims 38, 43 and 48 (i.e., 1) outputting the service content body and the browser content body; 2) assembling the contents in the same format by adding a content header for defining each of the contents to the service content body and the browser content body outputted; 3) multiplexing the contents assembled, which includes the service content body and the browser content body; and 4) modulating the contents multiplexed and outputting the modulated contents, which contain the service content body and the browser content body).

The AAPA, in Fig. 24, also discloses a receiving apparatus 2520 that restores contents by carrying out a demodulating processes (i.e., reverse of the modulating process performed by the transmitting apparatus 2510). The de-multiplexer 132 outputs the resultant contents to the storage device 133 for storage. However, although the AAPA discloses a process of updating a browser, the updating is performed immediately after the CPU 137 executes the browser regardless of whether or not the CPU 137 checks the type or the version of the respective contents. Additionally, the AAPA fails to disclose that the updating of the browser is done while the received contents are held in the de-multiplexer 132. In other word, in the AAPA updates the browser after the browser has been stored (i.e., in the storage 133).

On the other hand, in the present invention (as recite in claims 38, 43 and 48), the receiving side performs an updating of the browser in the same manner as the contents received prior to storing the contents.

Therefore, the AAPA fails to disclose or suggest at least the features noted above for the receiving side of claims 38, 43 and 48 (i.e., 1) updating the content having been stored with the content temporarily held when it is determined, based on the information extracted from the content header, that a content of the same kind and version as the content held is not stored).

Moreover, Schell fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in the AAPA. Accordingly, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of the AAPA and Schell, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 38, 43 and 48 (as amended).

Thus, independent claims 38, 43 and 48 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited prior art for at least the reasons noted above. Additionally, dependent claims 39-41, 44-47 and 49-54


are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited prior art based at least on their respective dependency from independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated October 31, 2007, and pass this application to issue.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuteru KATAOKA

By:   
Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45,794  
Attorney for Applicants

MDP(DMO)/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
February 29, 2008